

---

**From:** Hamayasu, Toru  
**To:** 'Ronald.Fisher@dot.gov'  
**Sent:** 10/26/2006 9:58:42 AM  
**Subject:** RE: Call from Councilchair Dela Cruz

Thank you Ron. I only mentioned you since you and I just had the conversation and the issue was somewhat broader than just for this project. I will certainly keep Jim in the loop. I really do like working with Jim and appreciate the fact he is the FTA project manager. It makes the project coordination much easier when we work with the manager who knows the issues better than us.

Toru

---

**From:** Ronald.Fisher@dot.gov [mailto:Ronald.Fisher@dot.gov]  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 26, 2006 9:42 AM  
**To:** Hamayasu, Toru  
**Subject:** RE: Call from Councilchair Dela Cruz

Toru,  
Thanks for the heads up. I'll be happy to talk to him should he call. While I'm happy to talk to you about these matters, in the future it would be best to discuss Honolulu project issues with Jim as well as he is the project manager for this effort and is feeling left out. I have advised him of my talking with you but it would be easier if you kept him in the loop all the time.

Ron

---

**From:** Hamayasu, Toru [mailto:thamayasu@honolulu.gov]  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 26, 2006 3:16 PM  
**To:** Fisher, Ronald <FTA>  
**Subject:** Call from Councilchair Dela Cruz

Ron,

You may get a call from the Councilchair Dela Cruz on the issue related to what is an LPA.

In today's council meeting I testified on their proposed bill (Bill 79). The issue, as we discussed, was about clarification of what is needed to define an LPA. I told them that the council is wrong to think they are selecting an LPA by voting on "mode" only. They define the mode as "bus system"; "bus system, other than high occupancy vehicles, and toll paying single occupant vehicles"; or "rail fixed guideway with integrated bus system".

I told them that selecting an alignment is a major component of defining the LPA. 49CFR, Part 611.7(a)(2) states, "The alternatives analysis develops information on the benefits, costs, and impacts of alternative strategies to address a transportation problem in a given corridor, leading to the adoption of a locally preferred alternative." This certainly implies that that level of information is needed to select an LPA. I did not say that is how an LPA is defined, recognizing that there is no definition in the regs.

The issue is that the Council passed a resolution last year demanding we complete the AA so that they can select an LPA before the end of the year, before the dedicated tax is levied Jan 1, 2007. This was the Council's deadline, not ours. I have no problem if they are simply reconsidering their self-imposed deadline and decided to do it in a two separate actions. My contention is that they can't pretend they met their own deadline by choosing the "mode" only.

What you may be asked by the Chair is if there is a federal requirement to choose alignment in the LPA. I told the Council that you and I had a phone conversation about this and agreed that "benefits, costs, and impacts" cannot be measures by only choosing the "mode", therefore, an alignment is a critical piece of an LPA.

Call me if this needs to be discussed.

Thank you,

Toru